of the Stockholm Code, this must be considered as the starting date for the epithet for purposes of priority. In 1829 Kunth made the combination *Oplismenus muricatus* which was, in effect, a transfer of Beauvois' epithet. The corrected synonymy for this taxon, as far as the epithet *muricata* is concerned, is as follows:

Panicum muricatum Michx. 1803. *non* Retz. 1786.
Setaria muricata Beauv. 1812.
Oplismenus muricatus (Beauv.) Kunth 1829.
Echinochloa muricata (Beauv.) Fern. 1915.

To place the name of Michaux in parenthesis, as the original author, gives an erroneous impression. As pointed out above, the epithet under discussion dates from 1812 when Beauvois used it in combination with *Setaria*. When *muricata* is used for this taxon, but in combination with other generic names, the citation of authority should show Beauvois (in parenthesis) as the original author. As long as the Homonym Rule stands in its present form, it is important for purposes of priority that care be used in the citation of authorities for those names containing an epithet which had been previously used for the same taxon but in an illegitimate combination.—John R. Reeder, Yale University, New Haven, Conn.

Scientific Books, Libraries and Collectors:—For a long time few people seemed to be very much interested in the history of science. Of late years, due primarily to the efforts of a few devoted scholars, the study of science history has taken on a new air of respectability. The price that is paid for respectability, however, in this study as in all others, is the production of a flood of books on the subject—a few outstanding, most tolerable, and a few poor. Even the worst, to be sure, have some value, but their faults need to be kept constantly in mind lest error and omission take on the cloak of verity.

In 1954 there was published a book of some 300 pages entitled "Scientific Books, Libraries and Collectors," and subtitled "A Study of Bibliography and Book Trade in Relation to Science."[1] The authors, J. L. Thornton and R. L. J. Tully state in their preface that they have "endeavored to record the chief writings of every prominent scientific author . . ." They modestly add that "the professional historian of science will find little new in these pages, but the student of the subject, and the scientist searching for 'bibliographical gaps,' will find between

[1] The Library Association London.

two covers an accumulated wealth of material on the bibliography of science."

This book, it must be admitted, reads easily and pleasantly, as long as one has only a vague acquaintance with the subject. When, however, a botanist reaches page 127 and reads that the 10th edition of Linnaeus' "Systema Naturae" (1758–59) is "of special significance because it has been taken as the basis of modern botanical and zoological binomial nomenclature," he is inclined to be somewhat amazed—and amused. He is perhaps inclined to think that the "Hortus Cliffortianus" (1737) and "Genera Plantarum" ed. 5 & 6 (1754 & 1764), which are not mentioned, are of somewhat more importance than the "Classes Plantarum" (1738) and "Flora Suecica" (1746 & 1755), which are mentioned.

At page 165 one is surprised to be told that Bentham and Hooker's "Genera Plantarum" is a mere compilation—an assertion which, if true, would indicate that this great work was considerably less valuable than it in fact is. At page 213 one is told that the "Index Kewensis" is considered to be a bibliography—one thing that it is not! One wonders why, if this, the standard nomenclator for post-Linnaean botany, is included, we do not find mention of Tournefort's "Institutiones Rei Herbariae" or Caspar Bauhin's "Pinax Theatri Botanici," two of the important pre-Linnaean nomenclators. For that matter, one wonders why Richter's "Codex Botanicus Linnaeanus," which collects the botanical material from the Linnaean publications as well as providing an extensive bibliography of both the Linnaean titles and the pre-Linnaean titles, was omitted. One is distressed to find that no reference is made to J. Christian Bay's critical "Bibliographies of Botany"—surely one of the most important bibliographies that we have.

Mention is made of Pritzel's "Thesaurus . . ." but notice is given neither to Jackson's "Guide to the Literature of Botany . . ." nor Zuchold's various botanical bibliographic titles, all of which supplement Pritzel. Some other notable, and unforgivable, omissions which may be mentioned are "The Catalogue of the Library of the Royal Botanic Gardens, Kew" and its Supplement; Merrill and Walker's "Bibliography of Eastern Asiatic Botany" and Nissen's "Die Botanische Buch Illustration" both of which are copiously annotated. Likewise, the sales catalogs of the German firm of Junk are omitted. For that matter, the catalogs of any of the larger firms dealing in antiquarian natural history books are mines of information for the bibliographer. Abstracting journals, which are certainly useful bibliographic tools, also come off badly. "Botanical Abstracts" and its successor "Biological Abstracts" seem to have escaped the authors' notice. Absent also is reference to the very useful United States Department of Agriculture publication "Bibliography of Agriculture." Also among the missing is the "Journal of the Society for the Bibliography of Natural History." Finally, we note the omission of the "Union List of Serials," a work which lists the library holdings of upwards of 120,000 titles in the United States and Canada.

The next to the last chapter deals with "Scientific Publishing and Bookselling." Despite the subtitle of the book, one finds here very little about the book trade. The house of Caxton receives some discussion, and a few continental publishers of that period are mentioned. We look in vain for mention of the house of Plantin. Longmans, John Murray, and Macmillan are mentioned but we search without success for Lovell Reeve & Co., Wilhelm Engelmann, or Martinus Nijhoff. In the United States, only D. Appleton & Co. and McGraw-Hill Book Co. are considered worthy of note. No mention is made of the various university presses which here carry on so much of the scientific publication today. Finally, and rather importantly, no mention is made of the several presses which are responsible for the production of technical journals.

The final chapter, "Scientific Libraries of Today," vies with the preceding for the title of "worst chapter in the book." Only Great Britain and the United States are considered at all, and the latter very superficially. We are told of the destruction, during the last war, of the library of the Manchester (England) Literary and Philosophical Society. No mention is made of the destruction of the library of the Botanical Museum at Berlin-Dahlem or the other scientific libraries in that city. We are told of the libraries at Kew and the British Museum (N. H.), but no mention is made of the library of the old Royal Botanic Garden at St. Petersburg (now Leningrad), though its catalog receives brief mention. Nor does the splendid library at the Conservatoire Botanique in Geneva receive recognition. For this country, no mention is made of the great holdings of natural history books at the University of California, at Harvard, and at the United States Department of Agriculture—to mention but three.

This review deals with only a small portion of the field that Thornton and Tully claim to have covered. All in all, they have not done so good a job as one might have hoped—or as other reviews would lead one to expect. True, within its limitations, the book contains a great deal of information and is, therefore, of considerable value. Most of the sins committed are those of omission—but each fact and figure needs to be checked carefully before it is quoted.—Gordon P. DeWolf, Jr., Bailey Hortorium, Cornell University.

Volume 58, no. 694, including pages 275–310, was issued 31 October, 1956.